

Attorney Docket No.: 940630-010015

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment substitutes for the November 3, 2004 Supplemental Response to the Office Action dated March 19, 2004.

The Specification has been amended to indicate that this Application is a division of patent application Serial No. 09/390,243, filed September 3, 1999, now U.S. Pat. No. 6,263,329; which is a division of patent application Serial No. 08/900,642, filed on July 25, 1997, now U.S. Patent No. 6,055,528. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action of March 19, 2004, claims 1-10 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,329. In response, Applicant submitted a Terminal Disclaimer and the required fee under 37 C.F.R. §1.20(d).

The amendments to claims 1-10 are made to overcome any potential rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification on p. 8, line 23 - p. 11, line 13. Specifically, the scores generated in the apparatus and method claims have been more clearly defined to include a first score of relevance with respect to all documents in a database, and a second score reflecting relevance with respect to documents having text in a second language. Although the first and second scores may in specific embodiments be identical, they are patentably distinct. No new matter is added.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Attorney Docket No.: 940630-010015

For the reasons stated above, Applicant believes the claims as currently presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Russell O. Paige (Reg. No. 40,758)  
Jones, Day  
51 Louisiana Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001

Tel. (202) 879-3939

Date: November 9, 2004

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**